| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/814,387 | 03/31/2004 | Mihai Florin Ionescu | 24207-10091 | 5527 |

62296         7590         04/08/2009
GOOGLE / FENWICK
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA ST.
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| NGUYEN, CINDY |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2161 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 04/08/2009 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| **Office Action Summary** | 10/814,387 | IONESCU ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | CINDY NGUYEN | 2161 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 March 2009</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.    2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-12,31 and 35-79* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3, 5-12, 31, 35-79* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All    b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

This is response to amendment filed 11/12/08.

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new

ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 31, 35-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102() as being

anticipated by Rouse et al. (US 6983310, hereafter Rouse).

Regarding claims 1, 42 and 61 Rouse discloses: a method, a computer program

product and a system for capturing event data associated with a plurality of different

types of articles  generated by a plurality of different client applications (see col. 1, lines

64 to col. 2, lines 36, Rouse), comprising:

Storing a plurality of different event schema (i.e., email module, calendar module,

forms module, view/folders module, default and customer actions module... see col. 7,

lines 53-58), each event schema associated with at least one of the types of articles ( information related to electronic mail, directories, calendar, scheduling applications) and defining a format for storing event data (see col. 5, lines 33-39, col. 6, lines 37-51; col. 14, lines 61 to col. 14, lines 10, Rouse);

Detecting an event, the event including a user interaction with an article (i.e., The list of register device users may be controlled by a system administrator or other authorized entity...track and maintain errors and other configuration information... see col. 4, lines 51-67; col. 6, lines 62-67; col. 7, lines 10-17 Rouse );

Responsive to the event, determining an event schema associated with the type of the article (request handlers... see col. 6, lines 20-36; col. 15, lines 25-35, Rouse); and

Storing, in a data store, event data identifying the event and the article using the format defined by the event schema associated with the type of the article (i.e., allows documents created and saved on the server... see col. 11, lines 16-21; col. 16, lines 49-52, Rouse).

Regarding claims 2, 43 and 62, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively.  In addition, Rouse discloses further comprising transferring the event data to a search application (see col. 17, lines 57-67, Rouse).

Regarding claims 3, 45 and 64, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively. Rouse discloses further comprising accessing and providing the event data to a requester by a search application in response to a search query submitted by the requester (see col. 17, lines 47-56, Rouse).

Regarding claims 5, 55 and 74, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively. In addition, Rouse discloses: wherein determining the event schema comprises accessing a registered event schema (see col. 4, lines 51-55, Rouse).

Regarding claims 6, 54 and 73, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively. In addition, Rouse discloses: wherein each event schema indicates information to be captured for at least one application adapted to access or manipulate the article associated with the event schema (see col. 4, lines 56-67, Rouse).

Regarding claims 7, 56 and 75, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 5, 55 and 74 above, respectively. In addition, Rouse discloses: wherein the registered event schema is an extension of another registered event schema (see col. 4, lines 56-57, Rouse).

Regarding claims 8, 57 and 76, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 5, 55 and 74 above, respectively. In addition, Rouse discloses: wherein at least one registered event schema has multiple versions (see col. 5, lines 53-55, Rouse).

Regarding claims 9, 58 and 77, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 5, 55 and 74 above, respectively. In addition, Rouse discloses: wherein at least one registered event schema is an extension of a predefined base event schema provided by a search application (see col. 4, lines 56-57; see col. 17, lines 46-67 Rouse).

Regarding claims 10, 46 and 65, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively. In addition, Rouse discloses: wherein the event further comprises user interactions with a client application or a client device to access the article (i.e., user may add a list of names, words or phrases which may then be selected on the mobile device... see col. 17, lines 34-56, Rouse).

Regarding claims 11, 47 and 66, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively. In addition, Rouse discloses: wherein determining an event schema comprises registering a new event (see col. 4, lines 21-30, Rouse).

Regarding claims 12, 44 and 63, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 2, 43 and 62 above, respectively. In addition, Rouse discloses: wherein the event data is transferred using one or a combination of the following information exchange mechanisms: Extensible Markup Language-Remote Procedure Calling Protocol (XML/RPC), Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP), Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP), Shared memory, sockets, local or remote procedure calling (see col. 6, lines 4-15; 36-42, Rouse).

Regarding claims 31, 48 and 67, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively. In addition, Rouse discloses: further comprising placing the event data in a queue and indexing the event data responsive to its position in the queue, the event data in the format described by one of a plurality of event schemas (see col. 9, lines 65 to col. 10, lines 10, Rouse).

Regarding claims 35, 49 and 68, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively. In addition, Rouse discloses: wherein the event schema describes the format of an event, the format comprising fields for at least one of event data associated with the event, an article associated with the event, or the content of the article (see col. 8, lines 55-62; col. 10, lines 25-52, Rouse).

Regarding claims 36, 50 and 69, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively. In addition, Rouse discloses: wherein the event is a real-time event (see col. 5, lines 55-56, Rouse).

Regarding claims 37, 51, 70, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 36, 50 and 69, respectively. In addition, Rouse discloses: wherein the real-time event is selectively indexed by a search application. On the other hand, Bates discloses: wherein the real-time event is selectively indexed by a search application (see col. 17, lines 17-30, Rouse).

Regarding claims 38, 59 and 78, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 5, 55, 74 above, respectively. In addition, Rouse discloses: wherein the registered event schema further comprises a schema identifier, and wherein the schema identifier and schema are stored in a searchable database (see col. 5, lines 32-39; col. 11, lines 16-21 , Rouse).

Regarding claims 39, 60 and 79, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 5, 55 and 74 above, respectively. In addition, Rouse discloses: wherein the registered event schema is configured to allow a search application to determine types of event data associated with an event (see col. 6, lines 17-36, Rouse).

Regarding claims 40, 52 and 71, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively. In addition, Rouse discloses: wherein the event is a historical event, the event having occurred in the past (see col. 9, lines 21-42, Rouse).

Regarding claims 41, 53 and 72, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 42 and 61 above, respectively. In addition, Rouse discloses: wherein storing further comprises storing associations between related events (see 16, lines 49-52, Rouse).

## Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4025. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. N./

Examiner, Art Unit 2161

/Apu M Mofiz/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161